



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/662,474	09/15/2000	Davis Pan	200308310-1	3606

7590 08/09/2004
IP Administration, Legal Department,
M/S 35, Hewlett-Packard Company,
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER	
CHEVALIER, ROBERT	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2616	9

DATE MAILED: 08/09/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/662,474

Applicant(s)

PAN ET AL.

Examiner

Bob Chevalier

Art Unit

2616

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 September 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 15 September 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4-6.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Thong et al.

Thong et al discloses a system to automatically link user input with a playback or recording of streaming data through time-correlated, event-generated data pointers. It is noted that the Thong et al's system discloses all the limitations recited in claims 1, and 19, including the feature of generating positional information, also known as data pointers, for identified events (See Thong et al's Figure 5, components 75a, and 75b), the feature of assigning time-stamp to each event (See the time-stamped event pointer index shown in Thong et al's Figure 5, component 67), and the feature of correlating from the first data stream to data in a second data stream based on the time-stamped data pointers as specified in the present claims 1, and 19. (See Thong et al's column 13, lines 30-33).

With regard to claims 2, 13, 20, and 31, the feature of the first data stream being a word processing data stream and the second data stream being an audio data stream

as specified thereof is present in Thong et al. (See Thong et al's Figure 5, components 85, and 83).

With regard to claims 3, 21, and 24, the feature of the time-stamped being generated by a common system logger as specified thereof is present in Thong et al. (See Thong et al's Figure 5, component 87).

With regard to claims 4, and 22, the feature of the system logger time stamps data in the second data stream as specified thereof is present in Thong et al. (See Thong et al's Figure 5, component 87).

With regard to claim 5, the feature of utilizing the data pointers to link events in the first data stream to events in the second data stream as specified thereof is present in Thong et al. (See Thong et al's column 13, lines 25-33).

With regard to claims 6, and 25, the feature of assigning time-stamps to the events in the first data stream and the second data stream to correlate events in the first data stream with events in the second data stream as specified thereof is present in Thong et al. (See Thong et al's Figure 5, component 87, and column 15, lines 52-67).

With regard to claim 7, the feature of identifying an event in the first data stream and locating of a corresponding event in the second data stream using the time-stamps as an index as specified thereof is present in Thong et al. (See Thong et al's column 15, lines 52-67).

With regard to claims 8, and 26, the feature of the time-stamps being generated from a common system clock as specified thereof would be present in the cited reference of Thong et al, since, Thong et al discloses that the recording unit 81 assigns

a universal time-stamp to each event pointer. (See Thong et al's column 15, lines 52-54).

With regard to claims 9, and 27, the feature of the time-stamps assigned to the first data stream and the second data stream being generated from separate but synchronized clocks as specified thereof would be present in Thong et al. (See Thong et al's column 18, lines 44-46).

With regard to claims 10-11, 14, and 28-29, the feature of the first data stream being asynchronous or presenting the first data stream with a time varying playback rate as specified thereof is present in Thong et al. (See Thong et al's column 18, lines 49-52).

With regard to claims 12, and 30, the feature of the event in the first data stream being defined by a fixed passage of time as specified thereof is present in Thong et al. (See Thong et al's column 16, lines 32-40).

With regard to claims 15, and 32-33, the feature of the first data stream including the audio data and having a playback rate dependent on detection of corresponding textual data in the second data stream as specified thereof is present in Thong et al. (See Thong et al's column 15, lines 5-10).

With regard to claims 16, and 34, the feature of the event in the first data stream being random events as specified thereof is present in Thong et al. (See Thong et al's column 15, lines 18-20).

With regard to claims 17, and 35, the feature of the additional data streams in which events are correlated as specified thereof is present in Thong et al. (See Thong et al's Figure 6).

With regard to claims 18, and 36, the feature of the first and second data stream being recorded in a storage device for later retrieval and the corresponding data pointers indicate a location of a corresponding event recorded in the storage device as specified thereof is present in Thong et al. (See Thong et al's Figure 5, components 81, and 87).

With regard to claim 23, the feature of the first and second event detector for identifying events in a first and second data stream as specified thereof is present in Thong et al. (See Thong et al's Figure 5, components 75a, and 75b).

Conclusion

3. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Chiu et al discloses a system for indexing and controlling the playback of multimedia documents.

Prasad et al discloses a method for event tagging for multiple audio, video, and data streams.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bob Chevalier whose telephone number is 703-305-4780. The examiner can normally be reached on MM-F (9:00-6:30), second Monday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thai Tran can be reached on 703-305-4725. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

B. Chevalier
August 5, 2004.


ROBERT CHEVALIER
PRIMARY EXAMINER